



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,781	02/28/2002	Monika Sandman	URUSAN 01	2047
27460	7590	06/07/2004	EXAMINER	
JOSEPH BACH 17460 LAKEVIEW DRIVE MORGAN HILL, CA 95037			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2172	2

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,781

Applicant(s)

SANDMAN, MONIKA

Examiner

Cam Y T Truong

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in this Office Action.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the computer program" in page 22, line 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al (or hereinafter "Rivette") (USP 6339767) in view of Rofrano (USP 6035283).

As to claim 1, Rivette teaches the claimed limitations:

"creating a secondary classification set defining a new classification field" as creating a classification set such as Assignee table, patent\_class\_type, Patent\_class\_xref. Each classification set has a list of new classification field. For example, Assignee table has several classification fields as Assignee\_ID, Document\_ID (fig. 12B& 58, col. 60, lines 5-20);

"mapping selected item numbers from the list of item numbers in said classification set onto said secondary classification set" as an assignee table 1201 includes information on the assignees of a patent. A given patent may have multiple assignees. For each assignee of a

Art Unit: 2172

patent, there is a record in the assignee table 1201. Each record of the assignee table 1201 also includes information, state information, the name of the assignee, and the city and zip code of the assignee. The above information indicates that the system mapping each selected record numbers such as zip code of the assignee from a patent in classification set assignee table 1201 (col. 59, lines 35-65, fig. 85);

“creating a decision tree for said selected item numbers” as creating a tree for patent numbers (fig. 122).

Rivette does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “creating a questionnaire corresponding to said decision tree”. Rofrano teaches customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempts to direct the information retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question. The above information shows that the system creating a list of questions corresponding to a decision tree (col. 1, lines 1, lines 64-67 col. 2, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to apply Rofrano's teaching of customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempt to direct the information retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question to Rivette's system in order to assist actual customers to products that they will most likely be interested in searching/retrieving.

As to claim 2, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said selected item numbers comprises a subset of said item numbers" as (fig. 78)

As to claim 3, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "providing a transfer function, said transfer function enabling deciding, for each item number in said classification set, whether it should be included in said secondary classification set" as (fig. 85).

As to claim 4, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein each of said item numbers in said list of item numbers further includes an item description, and wherein said mapping selected item numbers further comprises, at least for some of the item numbers, changing said item description" as (figs. 85-87).

As to claim 5, Rivette and Rofrano teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Rofrano further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said questionnaire is constructed in the form of a computer user interface" as (col. 1, lines 64-67; col. 2, lines 1-10).

As to claim 8, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said user interface further comprises a display field for applicable regulations" as (fig. 53).

As to claim 9, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said user interface further includes a keyword field for keyword search of said decision tree" as (fig. 118).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 10, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said user interface comprises hypertext" as (fig. 8).

6. Claims 6, 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al (or hereinafter "Rivette") (USP 6339767) in view of Rofrano (USP 6035283) and further in view of Hoffer (USP 5799151).

As to claim 6, Rivette and Rofrano discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein said classification set comprises one of the Harmonized Tariff System (HTS), the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), and a country specific HTS". Hoffer teaches HTS category numbers and country (col. 7, lines 40-67; col. 8, lines 1-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoffer's teaching of HTS category numbers and a country in HTS to Rivette's system and Rofrano's system in order to classify establishments in all fields of economic activity and define industries in accordance with composition and structure of the economy for retrieving/searching quickly and to provide with full shipping charges for the delivery of selected goods so that the shipping costs are paid as part of the overall price of the goods selected.

As to claim 11, Rivette teaches the claimed limitations:

"creating a secondary classification set" as creating a classification set such as Assinee table, patent\_class\_type, Patent\_class\_xref. Each classification set has a list of new

Art Unit: 2172

classification field. For example, Assignee table has several classification field as Assignee\_ID, Document\_ID (fig. 12B& 58, col. 60, lines 5-20);

“creating a decision tree for said selected item numbers” as as creating a tree for patent numbers (fig. 122).

Rivette does not explicitly teaches the claimed limitations” mapping selected tariff numbers from the HTSUS onto said secondary classification set; and creating a questionnaire corresponding to said decision tree”. Rivette teaches mapping received group names from user and match group names to group\_ids (fig. 85). Hoffer teaches the HTS topic boards system includes country codes from different countries (col. 8, lines 10-60). Rofrano teaches customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempts to direct the informant retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question. The above information shows that the system creating a list of questions corresponding to a decision tree (col. 1, lines 1, lines 64-67 col. 2, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to apply Rofrano's teaching of customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempt to direct the information retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question and Hoffer's teaching of the HTS topic boards system includes country codes from different countries to Rivette's system in order to assist actual

Art Unit: 2172

customers to products that they will most likely be interested in searching/retrieving and to provide with full shipping charges for the delivery of selected goods so that the shipping costs are paid as part of the overall price of the goods selected.

As to claim 12, Rivette, Rofrano and Hoffer teach the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Hoffer further teaches the claimed limitation "a subset of said HTS" as (col. 8, lines 55-65).

As to claim 13, Rivette, Rofrano and Hoffer teach the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Rofrano further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said questionnaire comprises questions requiring no knowledge of the HTS" as (col. 1, lines 1, lines 64-67 col. 2, lines 1-10).

As to claim 14, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said secondary classification set comprises blocks of classification items, each block corresponding to a different item class" as (fig. 23).

As to claim 15, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said questionnaire is constructed in the form of a computer user interface comprising hypertext" as (fig. 8).

As to claim 16, Rivette, Rofrano and Hoffer teach the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Hoffer further teaches the claimed limitation, further comprising using a company's business information to construct a transfer function, and using said transfer function to perform said mapping selected tariff numbers" as (col. 8, lines 10-60).



As to claim 17, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said secondary classification set comprises blocks of classification items, each block corresponding to different item class" as (figs. 8&85). Rivette does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein said transfer function maps selected items from said HTS onto a selected one of said blocks of classification items". However, Rivette teaches as an assignee table 1201 includes information on the assignees of a patent. A given patent may have multiple assignees. For each assignee of a patent, there is a record in the assignee table 1201. Each record of the assignee table 1201 also includes information, state information, the name of the assignee, and the city and zip code of the assignee. The above information indicates that the system mapping each selected record numbers such as zip code of the assignee from a patent in classification set assignee table 1201 (col. 59, lines 35-65, fig. 85). Hoffer teaches HTS contains grouping of goods (col. 8, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoffer's teaching of HTS contains grouping of goods to Rivette's system in order to provide with full shipping charges for the delivery of selected goods from different countries quickly.

As to claim 18, Rivette teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said decision tree is constructed in the form of an organization chart" as (fig. 164)

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al (or hereinafter "Rivette") (USP 6339767) in view of Rofrano (USP 6035283) and further in view of Pool et al (or hereinafter "Pool") (USP 6460020)

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 7, Rivette and Rofrano disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a subset of said one of HTS, HTSUS, and country specific HTS". Pool teaches import/export duties, America governmental taxation schedules based upon FOB point pries, Harmonized Tariff Schedules (abstract, col. 13, lines 60-67; col. 14, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Pool's teaching of import/export duties, America governmental taxation schedules based upon FOB point pries, Harmonized Tariff Schedules to Rivette's system and Rofrano's system in order to provide a transaction system whereby a buyer can go shopping by computer almost anywhere in the world using the buyer's language.'

8. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al (or hereinafter "Rivette") (USP 6339767) in view of Hartman et al (or hereinafter "Hartman") (USP 5987425) and further in view of Hoffer (USP 5799151).

As to claim 19, Rivette teaches the claimed limitations:

"at least one classification block, said classification block having selected HTS tariff numbers mapped thereto from a country specific HTS" creating a classification set such as Assignee table, patent\_class\_type, Patent\_class\_xref. Each classification set has a list of new classification field. For example, Assignee table has several classification field as Assignee\_ID, Document\_ID. as an assignee table 1201 includes information on the assignees of a patent. A given patent may have multiple assignees. For each assignee of a patent, there is a record in the assignee table 1201. Each record of the assignee table 1201 also includes information, state information, the name of the assignee, and the city and zip code of the assignee. The above information indicates that the system mapping

Art Unit: 2172

each selected record numbers such as zip code of the assignee from a patent in classification set assignee table 1201 (col. 59, lines 35-65, fig. 85);

(fig. 12B& 58, col. 60, lines 5-20);

“a decision tree for said classification blocks” as creating a tree for patent numbers (fig. 122).

Rivette does not explicitly teaches the claimed limitation

“a user interface enabling progression in said decision tree; wherein when operated, said computer program causes a computer to perform the functions comprising: enabling a user of said computer to assign an HTS tariff number to an import item by performing the functions comprising: asking the user to respond to questions relating to the characteristics of the imported item in order to progress through the decision tree and to arrive at an appropriate tariff number”. Harman teaches that a user interface allows dealer to enter a classification code for products (col. 10, lines 50-60). Rofrano teaches customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempts to direct the informant retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question. The above information shows that the system creating a list of questions corresponding to a decision tree (col. 1, lines 1, lines 64-67 col. 2, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to apply Hartman's teaching of entering classification code for products and Rofrano's teaching of customer interaction with current electronic catalog systems follows one of a plurality of pre-set paths along a decision tree, with the customer input typically being limited to

Art Unit: 2172

responses to pre-defined choices. Interactive on-line catalog sales applications utilize user responses to questions. Such system frequently attempt to direct the information retrieval by first gathering information about the customer and the customer's needs, before posting specific product question to Rivette's system in order to assist and quite actual customers to products that they will most likely be interested in searching/retrieving to maintain product information.

As to claim 20, Rivette, Hartman and Rofrano disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 19, Rofrano further teaches claimed limitation "wherein said classification blocks are expandable". Rofrano teaches catalog tree (col 1, lines 64-67; col. 2, lins 1-10).

As to claim 21, Rivette, Hartman and Rofrano disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 19, except the claimed limitation "wherein the tariff numbers mapped onto said classification blocks comprise a subset of said country specific HTS tariff numbers". Hoffer teaches HTS category numbers and country (col. 7, lines 40-67; col. 8, lines 1-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoffer's teaching of HTS category numbers and a country in HTS to Rivette's system and Rofrano's system in order to classify establishments in all fields of economic activity and define industries in accordance with composition and structure of the economy for retrieving/searching quickly and to provide with full shipping charges for the delivery of selected goods so that the shipping costs are paid as part of the overall price of the goods selected.

Art Unit: 2172

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Povilus (USP 5740425).

Art Unit: 2172

### Contact Information


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703-305-9790). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

5/27/04

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER